

product to America," you say to them, "Why do you want to produce there?"

"I want to produce there because we can hire people for pennies an hour, a dime, 12 cents, 14 cents, a quarter, or 50 cents an hour. We don't have the problem with pollution. We can pollute the air and the water. We can hire kids. We won't have OSHA looking over our shoulder because we don't have safe workplace standards, and we can just pole vault over all those things we have negotiated and fought about for 50 to 75 years in this country. We can pole vault over all of those problems as a producer and go overseas, close the U.S. manufacturing plant, hire foreign workers, have no problems on pollution, child labor and wage standards and then produce the same garage-door opener or produce the same toothbrush or produce the same vacuum cleaner and ship it to America."

That might be good for these corporations, but it is not good for America because inevitably that means diminishing America's manufacturing base. It means moving American jobs overseas and it means injuring this country's long-term economic strength.

That is what this debate has to be about: What is in America's economic interests; what is in our country's long-term economic interest; and, what will best represent the opportunity to create new jobs and advance our country's economic interests? That is what this debate must be about.

I hope in the coming couple of weeks, on behalf of farmers and wage earners, and, yes, American businesses, we can decide we have a trade strategy that doesn't now work, that causes substantial trade deficits, and substantial amounts of American jobs leaving and moving overseas. I hope we can decide that there is a better way and a different way. My purpose is not to promote some kind of xenophobic, isolationist, protectionist strategy. It is not to put walls around our country, but to decide that the trade between us and our trading partners must be mutually productive. We must have trade between us and Japan be balanced trade. If they get their goods into our marketplace, then we have a right to demand we get our goods into theirs. The trade between us and China should be mutually beneficial; that if we have something they want, they have a responsibility to buy it from us, and not demand that we manufacture it on Chinese soil at a time when they have a \$50 to \$60 billion trade surplus with us or we a deficit with them. It seems to me now is the time for us to demand that.

One of the reasons that I am pleased that we are finally going to have a debate about trade is that we have not been able to have any discussion about it. This turns instantly to a thoughtless discussion—instantly—the minute you start turning to the issue of trade.

Finally, maybe in discussing fast track this will become a thoughtful

discussion about what is in this country's best interests. Yes, expanded trade, but, yes, especially better trade agreements that are better for this country and trade agreements that are enforced with tough, no-nonsense standards, saying we represent the economic interests of our country—not other countries but our country.

The current trade strategy, resulting in huge recurring trade deficits, hurts rather than helps our country. Those are trade deficits we can solve by requiring that we be able to sell more goods around the world and by requiring that trade agreements be fair and enforced.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BISHOP ROBERT CARLSON

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the people of our State, and certainly all Catholics of the Sioux Falls diocese, are keeping Bishop Robert Carlson in our hearts and prayers today.

Bishop Carlson has been a vibrant leader within our communities and the Catholic Church in South Dakota. His outreach and partnership with social, religious and civic leaders for the past 3 years have been responsible for significant accomplishment.

I join with all South Dakotans in wishing him success as he endures his operation for cancer this afternoon. We certainly hope that with all of the good will, our faith, and the many prayers that are with him at this very difficult time, he will fully recover and that we see him back in good health.

We have no doubt that he will continue to provide the kind of strong religious and social leadership for which he is so well known. After some rest and recuperation his voice and involvement will be welcome, once again, on an array of issues confronting our country and the church. I wish him well.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1997

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, it is my understanding we will return to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will report the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1173) to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transit programs, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Chafee/Warner Amendment No. 1312, to provide for a continuing designation of a metropolitan planning organization.

Chafee/Warner Amendment No. 1313 (to language proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment, as modified), of a perfecting nature.

Chafee/Warner Amendment No. 1314 (to Amendment No. 1313), of a perfecting nature.

Motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with instructions.

Lott Amendment No. 1317 (to instructions of the motion to recommit), to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transit programs.

Lott Amendment No. 1318 (to Amendment No. 1317), to strike the limitation on obligations for administrative expenses.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues in the Senate, if they have statements in connection with this legislation, to come over and deliver them. Now is an excellent opportunity. I do not envision a great deal else happening this afternoon. But this is an ideal chance for those who have statements or questions that they wish to pose or to discuss the bill in some substance. Now is the opportunity.

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. The chairman of the committee is accurate. We all know that very often there is the tendency to wait until the last moment, and we do not get an opportunity sometimes to say what we want to say or offer amendments. Now is the opportunity to speak on the bill. Senators may have questions about the bill. This is an excellent opportunity to take advantage of that because there may not be another opportunity.

So I, first of all, encourage Senators who have an interest in one of the more important pieces of legislation, certainly one of the more expensive bills that this Congress is going to pass this year, to come on over. Tell us what you think. If you may have a problem with the bill, perhaps we can work it out. But now is the time. I urge Senators on both sides of the aisle to do so because this is an opportune time.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. It is my understanding that there would be an objection to amendments being considered. But absent that, Senators could come over